New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

SUNDAY, APRIL 16, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; R. H. Walds, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. $ .75 | Daily only, 1 month... $ .70
Daily & Sunday, 6 mos. 4.25 | Daily only, 6 months... 3.90
Daily & Sunday, 1 year. 8.50 | Daily only, 1 year... 8.00
Sunday only, 6 months... 1.25 | Sunday only, 1 year... 2.50

FOREIGN RATES.		CANADIAN RATES.	
DAILY AND SUNDAY.		DAILY AND SUNDAY.	
One month	$1.04	One month	$ .75
One year	12.00	One year	8.00
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	2.25	One month	.65
One year	4.00	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.09	One month	.25
One year	13.00	One year	4.50

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

Why Throw Away an Empire?

The report of the minority members of the House Committee on Insular Affairs disposes in few words of the latest Democratic argument for the Philippines scuttle—that the islands should be abandoned, because indefensible, as part of the preparedness programme. On the same basis of reasoning Porto Rico, the Panama Canal and Alaska would have to go by the board, because it would always be easier to give them up than to find an army and munitions to defend them if they were attacked.

The absurdity of this line of alleged thought appears the moment the abandonment of the Canal Zone or Alaska is mentioned. Even the present Administration has not reached the degree of absurdity involved in that suggestion, yet it is scarcely less ridiculous to propose to run from the Philippines—yet unattacked—because, forsooth, some day they might be somewhat hard to defend, being so far away.

For those who back the vicious Clarke proposal, one reason is just about as good as another. Always there remains the question, "Why?" "Why throw away an empire?" queries the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, in connection with resolutions, sent to both houses of Congress, denouncing the scuttle. Why waste all the money, all the human energy, which have gone into transforming those islands from a misruled, disease-ridden, semi-savage community into a clean, healthy, orderly colony, whose people, under American teaching in American schools, are well on the way to civilization?

Why abandon these wards of ours in the Pacific, for whose benefit the United States undertook the gigantic task it is performing so well? Why cast aside the material advantages of the purchase of the Philippines, so legitimately this country's, and so important to this country? Why hand over to competitors the export business from America to the islands—$28,000,000 in 1914? Why lose this vast tropic empire, the source of raw products of inestimable value to this country?

"Who is responsible for the adoption of the Clarke amendment?" the Republican members of the Committee on Insular Affairs ask. Not President Wilson, for he has said he considers it "unwise at this time." Who? Perhaps if that question could be answered, some real answer could be obtained to the innumerable "whys" which beset the scuttle proposal.

Typhus and the Iron Cross.

An example of the amazing success the Germans have had in imparting to all the world a profound belief in their efficiency and thoroughness is shown in the comments of a local critic, who cannot be suspected of German leanings, on the recent revelations concerning the prison camps at Wittenberg.

It is admitted that our Ambassador, who had heard the British complaints, described the conditions as "even worse than I had been led to expect"; it is admitted that the place was evidently "not a health resort"; it is even acknowledged that "its condition was bad." But the facts set forth by the British physicians must be wrong. Why? Because it is well known the Germans are efficient.

The British medical officers say that they were obliged to fight the outbreak of typhus fever alone, and that the German doctors left the camp and refused to give them any help whatever. An obvious falsehood, inasmuch as Wittenberg's head physician wears the Iron Cross and the Germans "do not decorate cowards." Thus that great symbol of efficiency disposes of the first lie.

Granted, then, that Dr. Aschenbach, with his Iron Cross, did look after his patients, are we to believe that he was slow in checking the outbreak? No; because the Germans have always "been prompt to fight typhus for the protection of their own army and civil population," and consequently we must believe that they were no less prompt at Wittenberg.

The British doctors say the place was overcrowded, that the patients were ill nourished and the surroundings were filthy and verminous. In short, according to their account, the conditions were as favorable as possible for the spread of typhus. The answer is that "only sixty died." Mark the *only*. The average case mortality in typhus fever is perhaps between 15 and 25 per cent, but on this occasion *only* 60 out of about 150 British patients died.

Altogether, Wittenberg was not so bad: overcrowded, indeed, but pretty well managed. There were sometimes as many as 15,000 prisoners there, and how many Frenchmen and Russians died we do not know. But more than half of the British patients recovered and only three of the six doctors died. The conclusion is that there is no use in quibbling over figures. Dr. Aschenbach's Iron Cross settles the matter. It proves that he handled the problem himself, and that is all we need to know. For, as the same critic observes as a clinching argument, "Germans do know how to handle disease."

An End of Democratic "Uplift."

The election of Mr. Edwin F. Harris of Saratoga County to succeed Mr. William Church Osborn as Democratic State Chairman marks the end of the "uplift"—"if uplift's the word," as Mr. Murphy once phrased it—within that organization. Mr. Osborn was a survival of the days of insurgency which defeated the Senatorial ambitions of William F. Sheehan and transferred the toga to Tammany's possession by way of the shoulders of Senator O'Gorman. He has done what he could to reconcile the jarring elements of Tammany and other brands of Democracy. He has endeavored to play Mr. Wilson's kind of politics, but the curves have been too dizzy for him to follow, and he has had no help from Washington. It is doubtless with profound relief that he retires.

Mr. Harris may not have such difficulties to surmount. He is a practical man, and recently has shown considerable ability in obtaining for the "organization" such Federal patronage as seemed meet. It is quite possible that he may even be able to persuade the President that so long as the Wigwam proves duly grateful for the appointment of "Joe" Johnson as Postmaster here there need be no anxiety about what the voters think of it.

There will, at any rate, be no taint of "uplift" on Mr. Harris. He has been officeholder under Tammany-controlled administrations; he is *persona grata* to Fourteenth Street. Abler and more experienced than Governor Dix's associate, Mr. Huppuch, he will be as amenable to the dominant voice in the party chorus as was that amiable individual. And the dominant voice still issues from Tammany.

The Cathedral Haters.

All who visit Rheims are shocked at what they conceive to be manifest evidence of German ferocity and vindictiveness. It is held by German apologists that the Cathedral had been converted into an observation post, but this circumstance, if true, is not alone sufficient to explain the damage done. It does not account, for instance, for the complete destruction of the Archbishop's palace.

"Modern artillery," as Lord Northcliffe remarks in the course of his account, "is mathematically accurate. For some fiendish reason the palace had been especially chosen as an objective. It is a building of only two stories, so low as to be of no possible value as an observation post. The guardian told us that over a thousand shells fell therein."

Sundry attempts have been made to explain the hostility of the Germans to Rheims, and in a volume lately published by the French Minister of Fine Arts M. Auguste Dorchain undertakes to show that the thought of destroying the Cathedral has haunted the Germans for at least a century. He quotes a curious passage from the "Rheinische Merkur," dated April, 1814, in which J. J. Goerres, an illustrious professor in his day, urged enthusiastically that the Cathedral be reduced to ashes, as the place "where Clovis was baptized, giving birth to the Empire of the Franks, false brothers of the noble Germans." Hence he regards it as quite reasonable that in 1915 the "Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger" should publish an ode by Herr Rudolf Herzog "in honor of the destruction of the Cathedral of Rheims," glorifying in extravagant terms the splendid work of the German howitzers.

It is difficult, however, to believe that the destruction of cathedrals is nothing but an insane obsession. The thousand shells that fell on the Archbishop's palace are still unaccounted for. Perhaps, after all, the Germans have as satisfactory an explanation as was offered by Garrett FitzGerald, the great Earl of Kildare, when he was charged before the English King with wantonly burning the Cathedral Church of Cashel. "By the Lord," said he, "I would never have done it had they not told me the Archbishop was within."

Hospitals and Æsthetics.

Under this title a New York architect, Mr. Grosvenor Atterbury, has published a little pamphlet which deserves the widest attention. He makes a plea for beauty in hospitals as a curative agency. The hospital, he points out, is still generally considered as a shelter provided for the surgeon's, doctor's and nurse's work, as an aseptic, well-ventilated workshop. Glittering white tiles, dead white plaster, huge windows, their glare undimmed by curtains; high walls, their rigid lines unbroken—angular unrelieved bareness, inhospitable, depressing in its meaningless monotony—this is the modern hospital. The patient is not so much a human being as a case. His mental reactions to all this ugliness are not considered. He is merely a transient; the sooner he passes out of the hospital's portals the greater its usefulness.

Who that has ever visited or spent a period of sickness in a hospital does not recognize in Mr. Atterbury's description his own reaction to this cheerlessly efficient environment? It is monotonous, not restful; it ends by being irritating, exciting—a mental condition dreaded by all physicians. It is to this lack of beauty in line and color that Mr. Atterbury, being a man, ascribes the readiness of patients to fall in love with their nurses. "Considered merely as a piece of decoration," he says, "the nurse has done more than any other one thing to counteract the blight of the hospital atmosphere." He might have quoted in further proof the passionate gratitude of patients for the flowers brought them by friends in their monotonous, harsh, white rooms.

"In treating the patient do not forget the man!"—he takes his text from the inscription over the doors of Virchow's hospital in Berlin. And, he holds, it is so simple a matter to make the atmosphere of the hospital warm, hospitable, soothing, instead of cold, indifferent, repellent. Quietly tinted walls—no reds, of course—diamond paned windows instead of the huge, glittering expanses of glass in their rigid metal frames, flowering plants, fireplaces, perhaps, and dark polished floors. True, the majority of hospital patients are not accustomed to beauty of color and line. But if it is considered necessary for their treatment to protect their ears and noses against familiar noises and bad smells, why not add to these negative curative agents a positive appeal to the eye? Their recovery will be all the quicker.

It is here that Mr. Atterbury approaches the economic phase of this question of the introduction of beauty in hospitals. Additional expense, initial and of upkeep, would be but small, he points out; the results would pay in the increase of the efficiency of the hospital, which, after all, is a plant for turning out cured patients as fast as possible.

The pamphlet abounds in striking observations, strikingly put: "Let us acknowledge at the start that the hospital has a grewsome reputation to live down, however undeserved it be to-day." "The less educated, the less intelligent the patient is, the more he depends on sensuous feelings for contentment. Sensuous ideas, the first to emerge from the mind, are the first to arouse delight, and constitute primitive happiness and content." "Society recognizes noises and bad smells as evils against which the individual should be protected, and includes the boiler and the glue factory, the brass band, and even church chimes, in the nuisance clauses, but discordant, hideous forms and colors are not mentioned. The sense of smell and the sense of hearing are protected, the sense of sight is left to protect itself or grow callous."

The architect presents his plea with all due deference to science. That he is in accord with it in his main contention admits of no doubt.

Two approaching anniversaries seem to be weighing heavily on the mind of the Administration. One is the anniversary of the Lusitania massacre, the other that of the famous Too Proud to Fight speech.

Quite the most dreadful result of the Zeppelin raids on England yet recorded is the fact, reported by an agent of Scotch golf ball manufacturers, that the links are deserted because every cloud looks like an invader to those who a short time ago thronged the greens.

THE DOOM OF THE CHESTNUT TREE

No Longer Will the New England Smithy Stand Under Its Spreading Branches.

(From the Boston Herald.)

Our native chestnut tree, for all its long tenure of our hills and pastures, is officially reported as facing complete extinction. "Cut at once and market quickly," is the State Forester's advice.

Unlike moth and borer, the bacterial blight that is killing the chestnut trees attacks with an infection as subtle as the breath of a pestilence. The disease is working across the state from west to east, as if with prevailing winds. It has already overrun five counties and has established centres through the rest. As one in every six of our timber trees is a chestnut, the commercial loss in many areas will be severe. No more farmers will send their boys and girls to college, winter by winter, from the sale of ties and planks and posts from the rapidly growing stands of straight chestnuts.

But the sentimental loss will entail even more regret. The chestnut tree, like its close cousins, the beech and oak, has made its own place in our rugged New England life. It enters our stories and poems and fireside talk as olive and palm enter the legends and songs of the Mediterranean. Its furrowed bark and open branching accord with our scenery and climate as the durability and bold figure of its wood accord with the old style virtues of New Englanders themselves. Its fruit is the sweetest of all our nuts. In the farmer's homely calendar its blossoming has always marked the time for the sowing of buckwheat; the parting of its burrs gives the signal for the uncertain husbandries between frost and freeze. With the disappearance of the chestnut tree from our landscapes the Boom New England movement will lose one of its attractive assets.

Deepening the East River.

(From The Providence Journal.)

There was no justification for a fight against the $200,000 item in the river and harbor bill for deepening the East River in New York. The battleships require a 35-foot channel; the present depth of water is a menace to the hundreds of millions invested in the craft on which dependence must be placed in the event of trouble with foreign nations. Yet the small appropriation was attacked on the ground of politics, although no one familiar with the requirements of the navy can see politics in a plan for providing an adequate approach to the New York Navy Yard.

The bad feature of the river and harbor bill programme is the willingness of the South and West to neglect our important ports in order that more money may be spent on mudholes of no particular use to the country. Fortunately the House retained the small sum asked for New York, and now it is in order to see that it is not stricken out in the interest of some petty and useless project before the bill reaches the President.

Nitchevo.

"The Russian soldier's one answer to all the hardships of war is *Nitchevo*—it is nothing."

God has sent us fire and steel and shell,
Turning Holy Russia into hell:
Who has sinned, and how? We cannot tell.

What the sickness, Lord, and what the cure?
We can kill, be killed, obey, endure;
This we know, and nothing else is sure.

Birth, love, pain and death, they come and go,
Sun and rain and harvest, wind and snow:
Why, and why? We know we cannot know.

Be it good to live or good to die,
Good to run with love, with pain to lie,
Nothing now we question or reply.

Nothing. Like a tide from Russia's soul,
Blind, and great, and terrible, we roll
Onward to the unknown certain goal.

CHARLES T. RYDER.

GREETINGS AND REMINISCENCES

Tribune's Birthday Brings a Letter from an Old Reader.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I read in my paper to-day that seventy-five years have passed since Horace Greeley published the first number of The Tribune and that scarcely a man is now alive who read the announcement as published at that date. I am one of the fortunate exceptions, and still live to read and enjoy this unsurpassed newspaper.

It was in 1840 that Horace Greeley issued the first number of "The Log Cabin," which contributed so materially to the election of William Henry Harrison. My father was building a house in 1840 and giving employment to a large force of mechanics, composed of about equal numbers of Whigs and Locofocos, and during the noon hour very heated discussion was had over the election, which I became much interested in. I read "The Log Cabin," which was freely distributed, and I became a warm convert to Mr. Greeley's writings during the campaign.

General Harrison was elected in November, inaugurated President in March, 1841, and just one month later he died, and April 10, the day set for his funeral, the first number of The New York Tribune appeared. Some years later, when it had doubled in size, the weekly edition had reached the country and was the leading paper taken. In the small hamlet of the writer more than fifty copies were taken, and when two mails a week were received The Semi-Weekly Tribune was taken.

Later the daily has been read for more than a half century—a liberal education to any interested reader. It keeps fully abreast of the times. The last stand you have taken in regard to non-advertising of the liquor trade is a move in the right direction. I like The Tribune and cannot well do without it.

H. N. GILBERT.

Fulton, N. Y., April 10, 1916.

Anniversary Wishes.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I desire to extend you my congratulations on the occasion of your paper's seventy-fifth birthday, April 10, none the less sincere for being one day late.

At that time (1841) I recall that I was rapidly nearing my own eighth birthday. At this writing I sustain the same relation in time to my eighty-third birthday; one of the few persons living who (through my father) had personal knowledge of and limited acquaintance with Horace Greeley.

My father became an early subscriber. I believe he had the first number of The Tribune. Few years of my own long life have been without its welcome visits.

This fact, unimportant as it is to you and to your latter-day readers, is fraught with many recollections that have helped to make life worth living through years of peace and years of strife, all of which have been faithfully chronicled by successors of the founders.

Kindly accept the trite but hearty repetition of "Many more happy returns of the day" to my father's friend and mine, The Tribune and its corporation. E. K. H.

New York, April 11, 1916.

Spoiling Our Readers.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A lot of people who write to The Ad-Visor are worrying about customers who get too much for their money. It would appear that there are many persons who just can't help getting double value every time they buy a shirt or a pair of socks, and many firms that exist only to oblige that sort of trade. Now, something of the kind is the matter with The Tribune. Weren't you doing enough for us, with F. P. A. and Briggs and all the rest of it? But no, you have to start up, with little or no warning, and put in a thing like the new Tribune Magazine. Take Mr. Gleason's Baedeker critique, which sounds as if Mark Twain had come back from the grave to write it, and on the very same page "Around the Year with Society." Why, that page alone is worth the price of the whole paper! This Sunday's Tribune isn't "a jitney's worth for a jitney"; it is nearer a quarter's worth. You must look out—there is such a thing as spoiling your readers.

C. I. CLAFLIN.

Newark, N. J., April 9, 1916.

The Tribune Offends Him.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: One gets tired reading rot in the newspapers and is tempted to boycott the whole mess. Here comes The Tribune sagely asking "Are We Prepared?" in big letters, and sagely whining that Forts Wadsworth and Hamilton and the Boston forts have only some three hundred each in their garrisons.

Does not The Tribune know that these forts are not intended for use in real war? Does not The Tribune know that General Sherman told us many years ago to protect our seacoast by underground forts invisible to the foe and even unknown to our civilian population? We naturally expect better things of The Tribune.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

New York, April 10, 1916.

A Suggestion for Saving.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Would you be kind enough and interested enough to suggest in your columns the fact that the Public Service Commissioners, who are now all appointed and confirmed, should be public spirited enough to suggest the saving of $15,000 to our overtaxed and burdened city, by accepting $10,000 each? That would be $50,000 instead of $75,000 as it now is. Their services then will be well paid, and I don't think any of them will resign. WM. H. FALCONER.

A reader of The Tribune since it was founded and a taxpayer for the last sixty years.

New York, April 10, 1916.

An Example for His Elders.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A youngster of seven was given a flag last Fourth of July.

Recently he asked his father to make him a miniature flagpole and an attachment permitting him to raise and lower his flag. He then placed the flag on a bureau near his bed, and on his own initiative he formally salutes the Stars and Stripes every night after saying his prayers.

Not bad for a youngster of seven, eh? This kind of spirit wouldn't hurt Americans of larger growth, would it? H. J. ACKERT.

Rockville Centre, L. I., April 12, 1916.

The Satisfaction Is Mutual.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Let me congratulate you upon the increased circulation of The Tribune. While a good Democrat, I still find considerable satisfaction in reading The Tribune every day, and am glad to note your increased prosperity. STEVEN B. AYRES.

New York, April 11, 1916.

Higher Mathematics.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: If it takes nine-tenths of the United States Army to chase one Mexican, how many soldiers will it take to catch two Japs?

N. G. HOLLIS.

New York, April 13, 1916.

GERMAN ABUSE OF CITIZENSHIP

The American Right of Free Speech Taken Advantage of by Hyphenates to Spread Their Teutonic Propaganda —Amendment of the Naturalization Laws Suggested to Permit Cancellation of Their Citizenship and Deportation of Conspirators.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The latest outburst of Dr. von Mach before the Labor Forum brings again to light the abuses of American citizenship. The champion of "milk for German babies" did not hesitate, according to newspaper reports, to warn J. P. Morgan of a possible death should the American financier ever fall into the hands of the Teutonic allies. The crime committed by Mr. Morgan which, according to Dr. von Mach, calls for a death sentence by the Germans consists in fathering the Allies' loan.

The personality of Mr. Morgan or of Dr. von Mach does not interest the people of this country. But the fact that because a German has become a naturalized citizen he may, in his love for Germany, threaten even indirectly a co-citizen deserves more than a passing remark. Liberty of speech is one of the essentials of the Constitution of which Americans justly boast, but when that liberty of speech is used to foster ill feeling, even animosity, it is time that something be done to curb such excessive language.

To the impartial observer it becomes evident that the Germans who emigrated to this country in the last fifteen years cannot be compared with the Germans who came here after 1848, who helped to build up the United States. The Germans in those days emigrated to America with the sincere intention of becoming Americans in the highest sense of the word. Prussian militarism disgusted them: repressed liberty prompted them to leave their native land. The Germans of those times were of the Carl Schurz type—men broadminded enough to throw off forever the yoke of a Prussian King and eager to find a hospitable refuge in this free country, which never had cause to regret that peaceful invasion.

They became ideal citizens and distinguished themselves in every walk of life.

But since the small confederate states became the German Empire, with a Prussian halo, things have changed. The new immigrants, particularly those who left their fatherland in the last twenty years, those who were educated in the school of Kultur, those who came here carrying in their mental baggage the Kaiser and Kaiserdom, they are not the immigrants of whom America can be proud.

The greenhorn who sets foot on these too hospitable shores, and who later on declares his intention to become a citizen of this country and in due time is naturalized, must not consider his naturalization a joke. There is such a thing as perjury in national life as well as in private life. The German—or, for that matter, any foreigner—who swears loyalty to this country and to its institutions does at the same time renounce allegiance to his former fatherland. So that he has but one fatherland, and that is the United States.

Our co-citizens of German birth do not seem to take this view of the question. Since the great war the "watchful waiting" and the "too proud to fight" policy has encouraged them to use provocative language which, under similar circumstances, would not be tolerated anywhere else. No one can blame them for hoping—even against hope—to see the Kaiser the winner in the present gigantic struggle; but they should refrain, to say the least, from insulting the American public. Patience may be a virtue, but too much patience becomes absurd. The Germans, being an educated people—and this is written without sarcasm—are more guilty than the Italian laborer or Russian peasant living here whose passionate love for his country leads him to utter threats against an American. It is worth while to note the attitude of American citizens of Allied descent with the attitude of American citizens of Teutonic descent. Observe the one and the other, and judge for yourselves who is a true American and who is not. We have not, since the war began, witnessed a single meeting organized by the pro-Allies which could embarrass in the least the American government.

Always respectful of American hospitality and true to their oath of allegiance, those descendants of Allied nations who have become American citizens do not abuse their privileges of free speech. They know that American citizenship, besides its privileges, carries with it its duties. And the first duty is to respect the President and government who direct the destinies of this country, regardless of their political color. We may fight at the ballot box to our hearts' content and indulge in loud language in electoral meetings, but in national affairs Democrats and Republicans melt into Americans.

Vituperation and insults have been heaped upon this government by German-Americans in public meetings as well as at banquets. Men who have the responsibility of conducting the affairs of this country have been abused under pretence of free speech. Because the Allies are buying munitions and food here, this country has been blackguarded. Because the Allies have been able to negotiate a loan here, this country is said to be sold to England. Not one leading German-American has dared to remark that the Germans can buy munitions here as well as the Allies; not one has had the moral courage to state publicly that loaning money is a business transaction. No; their attitude, under the cloak of American citizenship, has reached the acme of hypocrisy. That von Bernstorff has the audacity to issue orders to the American people by advertising a warning not to sail is natural. He is a German, a paid employe of the German government. But so-called American citizens who, after the sinking of the Lusitania, exclaimed, "Served them right!" have certainly forfeited their quality of citizenship.

Do these German-American orators not know that in every audience there are weak-minded listeners? Do they not know that such persons may easily be led to commit a political crime? Do they not think of their moral responsibility in case such a crime be committed? Or do they really believe that the obtaining of an Iron Cross from their Berlin masters when the war is over covers their pernicious conduct?

The discovery yesterday by the New York police of a German plot to wipe out with bombs the Allied commerce sailing from American ports and the subsequent arrest of four of the conspirators should be disavowed by leading German-Americans of this country, if their American citizenship means anything at all. But, judging by precedents, no such disavowals will come forth. When certain officials of the Hamburg-American Line were arrested, tried, convicted and sentenced some three months ago for issuing false clearance papers, German-Americans here should have publicly condemned them. In so doing they would have shown to their co-citizens and to the public at large their repulsion at anything that tends to make this country the headquarters of a conspiracy. But no. Their love for the Hohenzollern did not permit it. They did not understand, those so-called citizens, that it was their duty as law-abiding Americans to protest against the conspirators.

Such a mentality is a puzzle. It behooves, therefore, our legislators to so amend the naturalization laws as to make it a felony for any naturalized American citizen directly or indirectly to enter into a plot with foreigners to disgrace this country. The cancellation in such a case of the citizenship papers, followed by the deportation of the guilty party, would insure an adequate punishment. Such a law would meet with the approval of every citizen who is an American at heart, German-Americans as well as others. But the freak citizen must be taught once and for all that when in the presence of a court he has solemnly sworn allegiance to the United States and solemnly renounced all affiliation with his former sovereign such an allegiance and such a renouncement must be carried out effectively and mean exactly what they mean. He must know that when his little boy, with hundreds of other children, salutes the flag in school and says, "I swear allegiance to the flag and to the republic for which it stands," these sentiments are sincere, and that as the father of that child, if for no other reason, he must respect and honor them. If he does not, he is as bad a father as he is a citizen.

JONAS LIPPMANN,
Formerly of the "Journal d'Alsace."

New York, April 13, 1916.

"COLONEL ROOSEVELT FOR PRESIDENT"

Letters from Readers Regarding The Tribune's Advocacy of the Distinguished Ex-President's Candidacy—There Are Few Who Object, Whether or Not They Were Taft Men in 1912.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial this morning stating that you are for Mr. Roosevelt in the coming election is what your readers and friends have hoped you would have the courage to do.

The Tribune is the only paper that has had the courage and the conviction to come out and say what it thought, no matter who it hit, and the one paper that has put Americanism above party lines. Mr. Roosevelt has done the same, so it is only right that the two of you, the greatest living American and the greatest American paper, should be united to fight for the same cause—Americanism!

The American people at last realize their humiliation, and they will not again put in the chair a man who shamed the names of their forefathers by being "to proud to fight." They will let the world know that the blood that flowed so freely at Lexington and Gettysburg and dyed the snow of Valley Forge crimson still flows in their veins, and if necessary will be given just as freely so that Old Glory may "still wave o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave."

AN AMERICAN.

New York, April 13, 1916.

Can the Country Do Without Him?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The New York Tribune is to be congratulated upon seeing and talking straight (as usual) and for its important advocacy of Colonel Roosevelt's candidacy for the Presidency, that voicing the demands of all patriotic, intelligent and prudential Americans.

The United States needs those qualities which Colonel Roosevelt preeminently possesses. Colonel Roosevelt can live without the Presidency (and perhaps personally does not seek the responsibility), but the question is, can the country live as safely without his strong hand at the wheel of the ship of state?

Let us as prudent and patriotic citizens rally to his standard—let us haul our flag up to the truck, prepared and fearless in defence of the faith of our sires and country—determined upon this issue to make our stand. LINCOLN C. CUMMINGS,

Member First District (Maine, New Hampshire and Massachusetts) Naval Recruiting Committee.

Brookline, Mass., April 12, 1916.

No Traffic with Mutineers.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am a Republican. By your editorial of to-day you have shown (what I for some time have mistrusted) that The Tribune is not. When Theodore Roosevelt played the mutiny act and scuttled the old ship that had carried him through so many hard battles, he no longer was worthy of any position in her crew. Neither is he now.

No one but the rankest apostate, whose damnation was assured, would accept it. Now you will travel with such a sinner. We cannot be your companion. Inasmuch as you have advertised a Republicanism which you do not possess, you may stop sending The Tribune to me at once and return the balance of my subscription for the same.

M. E. STEPHENS, M. D.

Gardiner, Ulster County, N. Y., April 13, 1916.

Our Man.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: When a great daily senses the pulse beat of the nation's need it proves beyond doubt its ability to take its own part at whatever cost.

Your beautiful editorial headed "Colonel Roosevelt for President," which graced the honor page of your equally deserving paper to-day, is by far the most vital blow that was ever struck from that powerful weapon of progress called "the press" at the inmost core of that conscience deprived army of perverted pussyfooters who would rather sell their souls than to stand by the convictions of their own best parts, which is their all.

You speak the truth when you say: "We are for Colonel Roosevelt because we believe the country needs him. . . . If we are Americans, real Americans, the Colonel is our man." For he alone can change the destiny of this nation. He alone dares to face the whole world of autocratic selfishness and loathsome lust for tainted gold and not "pussyfoot a hair's breadth" from the chosen goal.

The issue of the day is Americanism.
And the man of the hour is Roosevelt.

LOUIS M. PAWLETT.

Bridgeport, Conn., April 13, 1916.

Vision and Courage.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Congratulations on your stand for Roosevelt! I have admired your clear perception and straightforward statement of our diplomatic bankruptcy. You have been a leader in the movement to rouse the country to its obligations and needs. I had begun to fear that political or other motives were the causes of your delay in getting behind Roosevelt, the man preeminently fitted to lead Americans along the way you have helped blazen. Your stand renews my confidence in you.

Democracy needs a prophet, a leader. Mr. Wilson lacks vision or courage or both. Therefore he has failed us in our need. Mr. Roosevelt has both, and the next election will show how deeply Americans realize their value. JAMES G. DALE.

New York, April 13, 1916.

Only One Issue.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I write to thank you for your leading editorial in this morning's issue, entitled "Colonel Roosevelt for President." I have been intending to write out a platform for my private use, but have not had time. I do not need to do so now. I have adopted yours. You have expressed my views exactly and much more succinctly and incisively than I could have done for myself.

My experience and views in the past have been the same as yours. I am sure that you have crystallized the views and spoken the thought of many hesitating and inarticulate citizens. There is but one real and essential issue now before the country, and of that Colonel Roosevelt is the only certain and efficient exponent available for the Presidency. THOMAS B. KERR.

New York, April 13, 1916.

What Better Combination?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Hearty congratulations to The Tribune for its manly stand to back Theodore Roosevelt.

With Elihu Root as Secretary of State, General Wood as Secretary of War, Congressman Gardner as Secretary of the Navy and Theodore Roosevelt at the helm, what better combination could we have? P. K.

New York, April 13, 1916.

Country Before Party.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: "Colonel Roosevelt for President." This is splendid of you. Those of your readers who place their country before their party cannot but be proud of their paper this morning. I wish to subscribe myself one of them.

GEORGE TAYLOR.

New York, April 13, 1916.

Never a Nobler Stand.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Hurrah for the grand old Tribune! In all your long and glorious history you never did a finer thing nor took a nobler stand than that of this morning in coming out for Colonel Roosevelt for President.

A TAFT REPUBLICAN.

New York, April 13, 1916.

A COMMON MENACE

Why We Should Join the Allies in Crushing Prussianism.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I believe that many of your readers would be glad if you would explain more fully to them how, in spite of your belief "that the success of Germany would be a menace to American ideals," you yet believe that we should not "intervene on behalf of the Allies" (The Tribune, December 4, 1915).

Starting with the former belief, our natural inference is that the success of Germany would mean that, as soon as she should have organized the results of that success, she would carry out the present irrepressible conflict between autocracy and democracy by attacking us, directly on or through the Monroe Doctrine. If the Teutons practically alone should be able to overcome the present very strong Entente, how could our democracy alone, manifestly the weakest form of government for resisting aggression, hope to defeat them when their resources should have received the enormous increase to be expected through adding to them the resources of her present enemies? Would not that increase very greatly the "menace to American ideals"?

Is there not the likelihood that many will infer that your position is: "The potential menace to American ideals is not to be resisted by overt steps to-day, when those steps would be effective, but either is not to be resisted at all or else is to be resisted only after it shall have become far stronger by the defeat of the natural allies of American ideals and by the strengthening of the menacer by his incorporating into his mechanism the strength of those natural allies of ours, his present enemies? We are not to fight this menace to-day when we can fight it to good advantage, but either not to fight it at all or to fight it after we shall have lost our advantage. The supporters of American ideals, of the 'faith that is democracy,' ourselves, Britain and France are not to resist autocracy together, but to fight it in detail, so as to throw away our natural advantage of superior numbers, our chief advantage to set against the greater cohesion of autocracy."

I, for one, cannot believe that this is your real position. But would it not be well to explain why it is not to our interest to take every overt step to aid now in preventing the menace to us of German victory over the Entente Powers from occurring? Further than this, if, as I infer that you believe, Germany menaces us in common with the Entente Powers, would it not be well to explain why this common menace does not create a common duty to resist it jointly? If a fire threatens a whole settlement, is it not the duty as well as the interest of the owners of the further houses to aid those of the nearer ones to arrest it?

HENRY M. HOWE.

Bedford Hills, N. Y., April 8, 1916.

German History the Clew.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The question is often asked and answered. Why has Germany, with its modern civilization and almost perfect system of education, stepped back to barbarism? After studying the history of Germany I have arrived at the conclusion that this war, as brought on by Germany, is the result of the actions and policy of the past rulers of the House of Hohenzollern.

In the reign of Frederick the Great, because of the wish of that famous sovereign to rob the rightful inheritance of another, terrible wars raged upon the continent for years. As Macaulay says: "On the head of Frederick (the Great) is all the blood which was shed in a war which raged during many years and in every part of the globe. . . . The evils produced by his wickedness were felt in lands where the name of Prussia was unknown, and in order that he might rob a neighbor whom he had promised to defend black men fought each other on the coast of Coromandel and red men scalped each other by the Great Lakes of North America."

Such was Germany in the past, and such is Germany of to-day. Truly, Shakespeare was right when he said in his "Julius Cæsar": "The evil that men do lives after them."

I congratulate The Tribune upon the stand it has taken in the present war.

EDWARD P. JONES.

Winsted, Conn., April 8, 1916.